arXiv:1412.0434v5 [math.DG] 4 Apr 2015

The stabilizer group of adjoint-invariant forms

Tran Do *
Department of Mathematics,
Vietnam National University, University of Science,
334 Nguyen Trai, Thanh Xuan, Hanoi, Vietnam.

Abstract

In this note we define the stabilizer group of any adjoint-invariant l-form on a complex simple Lie algebra. This result partially extend a previous result by Kable in [4].

Keywords: adjoint-invariant form, stabilizer algebra
MSC: 17B20

1 Introduction

Special geometries associated with a class of differential forms on manifolds are motivated by many known geometries including Riemannian geometry, symplectic geometry and geometries with special holonomy [3]. To study the geometry associated with a class of differential forms on manifold one needs to study the stabilizer group of those forms, for example, see [3], [6], [7].

Let $\mathfrak{g}$ be a complex simple Lie algebra and ω an adjoint-invariant l-form on $\mathfrak{g}$. We denote by $Stab(\omega) \subset GL(\mathfrak{g})$ the stabilizer group of ω and $\mathfrak{stab}(\omega)$ the Lie algebra of $Stab(\mathfrak{g})$. The group $Stab(\omega)$ is well-known if ω is the Cartan 3-form, see e.g. [4], [6]. In our paper we shall prove the following theorem.

Theorem 2. *Define*

$$M(\mathfrak{g}) = \{\phi \in GL(\mathfrak{g}) \mid \phi^l = id_{\mathfrak{g}} \text{ and } ad(X) \circ \phi = \phi \circ ad(X) \ \forall \ X \in \mathfrak{g}\}$$

Then $M(\mathfrak{g})$ is an abelian normal subgroup of $Stab(\omega)$ and $Stab(\omega)$ is isomorphic to

$$Aut(\mathfrak{g}) \ltimes M(\mathfrak{g})$$

via the map $(\alpha, \phi) \mapsto \alpha\phi$.

The main step in proving Theorem 2 is to establish the following theorem.

*E-mail: trando1992@gmail.com

Theorem 1. *The stabilizer algebra of any adjoint-invariant l-form on a simple Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ coincides with $\mathfrak{ad}(\mathfrak{g})$ if $l < dim(\mathfrak{g})$.*

Our plan is as follows

In the second section, we introduce a new notion of a ϵ-decomposable form (see Definition 1), which will be needed in the proof of Theorem 1, and recall a result of Kempf (see Lemma 1).

In the third section, we prove Theorem 1 and Theorem 2.

I want to express my special thanks to my advisor Professor Hông Vân Lê for proposing me this problem and for her useful advice and comments. I also would like to thank Professor Anthony C. Kable for his kind interest in this work.

2 Preliminary

In this note, we assume that $\mathfrak{g}$ is a complex simple Lie algebra.

Let V be a vector space of dimension n, and $\epsilon = \{e^1, e^2, \dots e^n\}$ a basic of V^*. An l-form ω of V can be written as

$$\omega = \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \ldots < i_l \leq n} a_{i_1 \ldots i_l} e^{i_1} \wedge e^{i_2} \wedge e^{i_3} \ldots \wedge e^{i_l},$$

we call it the canonical form of ω with respect to ϵ. For each element A of $\mathfrak{gl}(V)$ we define

$$\omega_A := A(\omega) = \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \ldots < i_l} \sum_j a_{i_1 \ldots i_l} e^{i_1} \wedge e^{i_2} \wedge e^{i_3} \ldots \wedge A(e^{i_j}) \ldots \wedge e^{i_l}.$$

The action of $gl(V)$ on $\Lambda^l \mathfrak{g}^*$ defined in this formula is the differential of the standard action of $GL(V)$ on $\Lambda^l \mathfrak{g}^*$.

Definition 1. (ϵ-decomposable form)
Let V be a vector space of dimension n, and $\epsilon = \{e^1, e^2, \dots e^n\}$ a basic of V^*. An l-form ω will be called *ϵ-decomposable* if it can be written as

$$\omega = e^{i_1} \wedge e^{i_1} \wedge \ldots \wedge e^{i_l}$$

where $1 \leq i_1, i_2, \dots, i_l \leq n$ are integers.

Define the *ϵ-presentation* of a form γ to be the expression of γ as the sum of ϵ-decomposable forms.

Definition 2. (Equivalent ϵ-decomposable forms)
We say two ϵ-decomposable forms α, β *equivalent* if α appears as a summand in the ϵ-presentation of β_A for some $A \in \mathfrak{gl}(V)$.

Proposition 1. *Two ϵ-decomposable l-forms α and β are equivalent if and only if we can write $\alpha = a \wedge \gamma$, $\beta = b \wedge \gamma$, for some $a, b \in \epsilon$, and $\gamma = e^{i_1} \wedge e^{i_2} \wedge \ldots \wedge e^{i_{l-1}}$.*

Proof. If we can write $\alpha = a \wedge \gamma$, $\beta = b \wedge \gamma$, where $a, b \in \epsilon$, $\gamma = e^{i_1} \wedge e^{i_2} \wedge \ldots \wedge e^{i_{l-1}}$, then we can choose an element $A \in \mathfrak{gl}(\mathfrak{g})$ such that it transforms b to a. Then, α is a summand in the ϵ-presentation of β_A.

Conversely, assume that α and β are equivalent. Then there exists $A \in \mathfrak{gl}(V)$ such that α is a summand in the ϵ-presentation of β_A. We write $\beta = e^{i_1} \wedge e^{i_2} \wedge \ldots \wedge e^{i_l}$, then $A(\beta) = \sum_{j=1}^{l} e^{i_1} \wedge e^{i_2} \wedge \ldots \wedge A(e^{i_j}) \wedge \ldots \wedge e^{i_l}$. Hence, α appears as a summand of $A(\beta)$ only if it has the form $\alpha = a \wedge \gamma$, where $\gamma = e^{j_1} \wedge e^{j_2} \wedge \ldots \wedge e^{j_{(l-1)}}$, $\{j_1, j_2, \ldots, j_{(l-1)}\} \subset \{i_1, i_2, \ldots i_l\}$, $a \in \epsilon$. □

For the proof of Theorem 1 we also need the classification result by Dynkin in [2]. Let us briefly recall necessary notions which are used in the Dynkin classification. Suppose that ρ_α and ρ_β are representations of α_2 and β_2 on V_α and V_β respectively, then two triples $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \rho_\alpha)$ and $(\beta_1, \beta_2, \rho_\beta)$ are called equivalent if there is a linear isomorphism $L : V_\alpha \to V_\beta$ such that $\rho_\beta(\beta_2) = L\rho_\alpha L^{-1}$. The classification will be found in Table 5 of [2].

We also introduce a result by Gorge R. Kempf in [5]. The following lemmas are Corollary 4.4 and Corollary 3.5 in that paper. We restate them here in simpler forms where G is an affine algebraic group and X is an affine variety.

Lemma 1 (Corollary 4.4, [5])**.** *Given $\rho : G \times X \to X$ an action of an affine algebraic group G on an affine variety X and x a point in X. If the orbit O_x of x is not closed in X then G possesses a non-trivial one parameter subgroup $\lambda : G_m \to G$.*

Lemma 2 (Corollary 3.5, [5])**.** *In the situation of Lemma 1, the set*

$$P(\lambda) := \{g \in G \mid \lim_{t \to 0} \lambda(t) g \lambda(t)^{-1} \text{ exists in } G\}$$

is a parabolic subgroup of G which contains the stabilizer subgroup of x in G.

3 Main result

We state the main result of this paper.

Theorem 1. *The stabilizer algebra of any adjoint-invariant l-form on a simple Lie algebra g coincides with $\mathfrak{ad}(\mathfrak{g})$ if $l < dim(\mathfrak{g})$.*

First, we will prove that $\mathfrak{stab}(\mathfrak{g})$ is a simple Lie algebra (Proposition 2). To prove it, we need the following lemma.

Lemma 3. *Denote $SL(\mathfrak{g})(.)$ the standard action of $SL(\mathfrak{g})$ on $\Lambda^l \mathfrak{g}^*$. Then the orbit $O(\omega) = SL(\mathfrak{g})(\omega)$ is closed in $\Lambda^l \mathfrak{g}^*$ under the Zariski topology, consequently $O(\omega)$ is an affine variety.*

Proof. Suppose conversely that $O(\omega)$ is not closed. Applying Lemma 1 and Lemma 2, we can find a non-trivial one-parameter subgroup $\lambda : G_m \to SL(\mathfrak{g})$ of $SL(\mathfrak{g})$ and a parabolic subgroup

$$P(\lambda) = \{g \in SL(\mathfrak{g}) \mid \lim_{t\to 0} \lambda(t) g \lambda(t)^{-1} \text{ exists in } SL(\mathfrak{g})\}$$

of $SL(\mathfrak{g})$ containing the stabilizer subgroup of ω in $SL(\mathfrak{g})$.

Because $\mathfrak{g}$ is a simple Lie algebra, we have

$$\mathfrak{ad}(\mathfrak{g}) = [\mathfrak{ad}(\mathfrak{g}), \mathfrak{ad}(\mathfrak{g})] \subset [\mathfrak{gl}(\mathfrak{g}), \mathfrak{gl}(\mathfrak{g})] \subset \mathfrak{sl}(\mathfrak{g}).$$

Hence,

$$Aut_0(\mathfrak{g}) = \exp(\mathfrak{ad}(\mathfrak{g})) \subset \exp(\mathfrak{sl}(\mathfrak{g})) \subset SL(\mathfrak{g}).$$

In addition, the stabilizer group of ω contains $Aut_0(\mathfrak{g})$, consequently $P(\lambda)$ contains $Aut_0(\mathfrak{g})$.

As $\lambda(t)$ is a one parameter subgroup of $SL(\mathfrak{g})$, there exists a basis $\{e_1, e_2 \ldots, e_n\}$ of $\mathfrak{g}$ such that the action of $\lambda(t)$ on $\mathfrak{g}$ can be written in the matrix form

$$\lambda(t) = \begin{pmatrix} t^{m_1} & 0 & \ldots & 0 \\ 0 & t^{m_2} & \ldots & 0 \\ \ldots & & & \\ 0 & \ldots & 0 & t^{m_n} \end{pmatrix},$$

where n is the dimension of $\mathfrak{g}$ and $m_1 \leq m_2 \leq \ldots \leq m_n$ are integers.
Then for any matrix $A = (a_{ij}) \in SL(\mathfrak{g})$ we have

$$\lambda(t) A \lambda(t)^{-1} = (t^{m_i - m_j} a_{ij})_{n\times n}.$$

Thus, if $A \in P(\lambda)$ then $a_{ij} = 0$ for $m_i < m_j$. Let i_0 be the greatest number such that $m_1 = m_2 = \ldots = m_{i_0}$. Then

$$a_{ij} = 0$$

for any i, j such that $1 \leq i \leq i_0 < j \leq n$. Therefore, the vector subspace V spanned by $\{e_1, e_2, \ldots, e_{i_0}\}$ is invariant under the action of $P(\lambda)$. As a result, V is stable under the action of $Aut_0(\mathfrak{g})$.

Because $\mathfrak{g}$ is simple, the action of $Aut_0(\mathfrak{g})$ on $\mathfrak{g}$ is irreducible, hence V should be either 0 or $\mathfrak{g}$. Notice that $V \neq 0$ for $e_1 \in V$, we have $V = \mathfrak{g}$. It follows $i_0 = n$, in other words

$$m_1 = m_2 = \ldots = m_n.$$

Furthermore, $P(\lambda)$ is a subset of $SL(\mathfrak{g})$ and this implies $\lambda(t) \subset SL(\mathfrak{g})$. It follows that $det(\lambda(t)) = 1$. As a result,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} m_i = 0.$$

In addition, we have

$$m_1 = m_2 = \ldots = m_n,$$

hence

$$m_1 = m_2 = \ldots = m_n = 0.$$

And therefore $\lambda(t) \equiv I_n$, which contradicts with the assumption that $\lambda(t)$ is non-trivial.

□

Remark 1. *The idea of using Lemma 1 in the above proof comes from Theorem 1 in [4]. In fact, Kable's proof of Theorem 1 in [4] is applicable in our case. However, our proof is simpler, more specifically, we do not need to compute* $\lim_{t\to 0} \lambda(t)\omega$.

Lemma 4. *The commutant of* $\mathfrak{ad}(\mathfrak{g})$ *in* $\mathfrak{stab}(\omega)$ *is zero.*

Proof. Since $\mathfrak{g}$ is simple, then $\mathfrak{ad}(\mathfrak{g})$ is simple. It follows that

$$[\mathfrak{ad}(\mathfrak{g}), \mathfrak{ad}(\mathfrak{g})] = \mathfrak{ad}(\mathfrak{g}),$$

hence

$$\mathfrak{ad}(\mathfrak{g}) = [\mathfrak{ad}(\mathfrak{g}), \mathfrak{ad}(\mathfrak{g})] \subset [\mathfrak{gl}(\mathfrak{g}), \mathfrak{gl}(\mathfrak{g})] \subset \mathfrak{sl}(\mathfrak{g}).$$

Let ϕ be a non-zero element in $\mathfrak{stab}(\omega)$ commuting with $\mathfrak{ad}(\mathfrak{g})$. We have $ker(\phi)$ is an ideal of $\mathfrak{g}$. Because $\mathfrak{g}$ is simple, $ker(\phi)$ is either 0 or $\mathfrak{g}$. Notice that $ker(\phi) \neq \mathfrak{g}$ as ϕ is non-zero, it follows that $ker(\phi) = 0$. As a result, ϕ possesses a non-zero eigenvalue c.

Denoted by X an eigenvector of ϕ corresponding to c. Consider $\psi = \phi - cI$, then $\psi(X) = 0$. Further, as ϕ commutes with $\mathfrak{ad}(\mathfrak{g})$, then ψ also commutes with $\mathfrak{ad}(\mathfrak{g})$. It yields that if ψ is different from zero, then we obtain $ker(\psi) = 0$, contradicts with the fact that $X \in ker(\psi)$. Thus, $\psi = 0$. Therefore

$$\phi(X) = cX$$

for any X in $\mathfrak{g}$ and for some constant $c \in \mathbb{C}$. It follows that

$$\phi \circ \omega = -c.l.\omega.$$

It implies $c = 0$ as $\phi \circ \omega = 0$. In other words, $\phi = 0$, a contradiction since $\phi \neq 0$, by which the lemma follows. □

As a direct consequence of Lemma 4 we obtain the following

Corollary 1. *The Lie subalgebra* $\mathfrak{stab}(\omega)$ *has zero center.*

Lemma 5. *The Lie subalgebra* $\mathfrak{stab}(\omega)$ *is semisimple and contained in* $\mathfrak{sl}(\mathfrak{g})$.

Proof. Let

$$I(\omega) = Stab(\omega) \cap SL(\mathfrak{g})$$

and $\mathfrak{i}(\omega)$ its Lie algebra. Since the commutant of $\mathfrak{ad}(\mathfrak{g})$ in $\mathfrak{stab}(\omega)$ is zero, then the commutant of $\mathfrak{ad}(\mathfrak{g})$ in $\mathfrak{i}(\omega)$ is zero. Hence, $\mathfrak{i}(\omega)$ has zero center.

Lemma 3 shows that $SL(\mathfrak{g})/I(\omega)$ is an affine variety. Matsushima's criterion [1] then implies $I(\omega)$ is reductive, hence $\mathfrak{i}(\omega)$ is reductive. Furthermore, $\mathfrak{i}(\omega)$ has zero center, it is semisimple.

Let $\mathfrak{h} = \mathfrak{stab}(\omega) \setminus \mathfrak{i}(\omega)$ be the set complement of $\mathfrak{i}(\omega)$ in $\mathfrak{stab}(\omega)$. Since

$$[\mathfrak{gl}(\mathfrak{g}), \mathfrak{gl}(\mathfrak{g})] \subset \mathfrak{sl}(\mathfrak{g}),$$

then

$$[\mathfrak{i}(\omega), \mathfrak{stab}(\omega)] \subset \mathfrak{sl}(\mathfrak{g}).$$

But we already have

$$[\mathfrak{i}(\omega), \mathfrak{stab}(\omega)] \subset \mathfrak{stab}(\omega),$$

thus

$$[\mathfrak{i}(\omega), \mathfrak{stab}(\omega)] \subset \mathfrak{sl}(\mathfrak{g}) \cap \mathfrak{stab}(\mathfrak{g}) = \mathfrak{i}(\omega).$$

Therefore, $\mathfrak{i}(\omega)$ is an ideal of $\mathfrak{stab}(\omega)$.

Suppose that $\mathfrak{stab}(\omega)$ has some abelian ideal α. We have two cases

1. **Case 1** $\alpha \subset \mathfrak{h}$

   We have

   $$[\alpha, \mathfrak{i}(\omega)] \subset [\mathfrak{h}, \mathfrak{i}(\omega)] \subset \mathfrak{i}(\omega)$$

   and

   $$[\alpha, \mathfrak{i}(\omega)] \subset \alpha \subset \mathfrak{h}\,.$$

   Since $\mathfrak{h}$ is the set complement of $\mathfrak{i}(\omega)$ in $\mathfrak{stab}(\omega)$, we have $[\alpha, \mathfrak{i}(\omega)] = 0$. In other words, α commutes with $\mathfrak{i}(\omega)$. In particular, α commutes with $\mathfrak{ad}(\mathfrak{g})$. Lemma 4 then implies $\alpha = 0$.

2. **Case 2** $\alpha \nsubseteq \mathfrak{h}$

   We have $\alpha \cap \mathfrak{i}(\omega) \neq 0$ is a non-zero abelian ideal of $\mathfrak{i}(\omega)$, which contradicts with the fact that $\mathfrak{i}(\omega)$ is semisimple.

Therefore, $\mathfrak{stab}(\omega)$ is semisimple. Hence,

$$[\mathfrak{stab}(\omega), \mathfrak{stab}(\omega)] = \mathfrak{stab}(\omega),$$

consequently,

$$\mathfrak{stab}(\omega) = [\mathfrak{stab}(\omega), \mathfrak{stab}(\omega)] \subset [\mathfrak{gl}(\mathfrak{g}), \mathfrak{gl}(\mathfrak{g})] \subset \mathfrak{sl}(\mathfrak{g}).$$

□

Remark 2. *The idea of using Matsushima's criterion [1] in Proposition 5 comes from the proof of Theorem 2 in Kable's paper [4]. Indeed, Kable's proof works in our case but here we give a different proof.*

Proposition 2. *The stabilizer algebra* $\mathfrak{stab}(\omega)$ *is simple.*

Proof. Since $\mathfrak{stab}(\omega)$ is semisimple, we can write it as a sum of non-zero simple ideals,

$$\mathfrak{stab}(\omega) = \mathcal{S}_1 \oplus \mathcal{S}_2 \oplus \ldots \oplus \mathcal{S}_k \,.$$

Since $\mathfrak{ad}(\mathfrak{g}) \subset \mathfrak{stab}(\mathfrak{g})$ and the action of $\mathfrak{ad}(\mathfrak{g})$ on $\mathfrak{g}$ is irreducible then $\mathfrak{stab}(\omega)$ acts irreducibly on $\mathfrak{g}$. For each i, we consider the action of $\mathcal{S}_i$ on $\mathfrak{g}$ and denote $V_i := ker(\mathcal{S}_i)$. As $\mathcal{S}_i$ is an ideal of $\mathfrak{stab}(\omega)$, we have $[\mathfrak{ad}(\mathfrak{g}), \mathcal{S}_i] \subset \mathcal{S}_i$. We then obtain

$$[\mathfrak{ad}(\mathfrak{g}), \mathcal{S}_i](V_i) = 0,$$

more specifically

$$(\mathfrak{ad}_X \circ A - A \circ \mathfrak{ad}_X)(V_i) = 0,$$

for any $X \in \mathfrak{g}$, $A \in \mathcal{S}_i$.
It follows

$$A \circ \mathfrak{ad}_X(V_i) = 0, \forall A \in \mathcal{S}_i \,.$$

Consequently

$$\mathfrak{ad}_X(V_i) \subset ker(\mathcal{S}_i) = V_i,$$

hence $\mathfrak{ad}(\mathfrak{g})V_i \subset V_i$. In other words, V_i is a subrepresentation of $\mathfrak{ad}(\mathfrak{g})$ on $\mathfrak{g}$, V_i must be either 0 or $\mathfrak{g}$. If $V_i = \mathfrak{g}$ then $ker(\mathcal{S}_i) = \mathfrak{g}$, which implies $\mathcal{S}_i = 0$, a contradiction. Thus $ker(\mathcal{S}_i) = 0$, that is $\mathcal{S}_i\, \mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}$.

We now can consider the representations from each $\mathcal{S}_i$ on $\mathfrak{g}$.
We have the following

Claim 1. *The representation of* $\mathcal{S}_1$ *on* $\mathfrak{g}$ *is irreducible.*

Proof (of the claim). Let $U(\mathfrak{stab}(\omega)), U(\mathcal{S}_1), U(\mathcal{S}_2), \ldots, U(\mathcal{S}_k)$ be the smallest associative subalgebras of $\mathfrak{gl}(\mathfrak{g})$ containing $\mathfrak{stab}(\omega), \mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2, \ldots \mathcal{S}_k$, respectively.

Since,

$$\mathfrak{stab}(\omega) = \mathcal{S}_1 \oplus \mathcal{S}_2 \oplus \ldots \oplus \mathcal{S}_k,$$

then

$$U(\mathfrak{stab}(\omega)) = U(\mathcal{S}_1) + U(\mathcal{S}_2) + \ldots + U(\mathcal{S}_k).$$

Furthermore, as $\mathcal{S}_i$'s are simple ideals of $\mathfrak{stab}(\mathfrak{g})$, $\mathcal{S}_i$ and $\mathcal{S}_j$ are commute under the Lie bracket. It means

$$[X_i, X_j] = 0 \ \forall X_i \ \in \mathcal{S}_i, X_j \in \mathcal{S}_j, i \neq j.$$

In other words,

$$X_i X_j = X_j X_i \ \forall X_i \ \in \mathcal{S}_i, X_j \in \mathcal{S}_j, i \neq j.$$

It follows that $U(\mathcal{S}_i)$ and $U(\mathcal{S}_j)$ are commute.

Now, suppose that $\mathcal{S}_1$ does not act irreducibly on $\mathfrak{g}$. As $\mathcal{S}_1$ is a simple Lie algebra, the action of $\mathcal{S}_1$ on $\mathfrak{g}$ reduced completely. We can write $\mathfrak{g}$ as a sum of non-zero irreducible subrepresentations of $\mathcal{S}_1$

$$\mathfrak{g} = V_1 \oplus V_2 \ldots \oplus V_m$$

Consider the action of $\mathcal{S}_1$ on V_i, because $ker(\mathcal{S}_1) = 0$, then $\mathcal{S}_1(V_i) = V_i$, and hence $U(\mathcal{S}_1)(V_i) = V_i$. Let B be any element in $U(\mathcal{S}_2)$ such that $B(V_1) \neq 0$. Since $U(\mathcal{S}_1)$ and $U(\mathcal{S}_2)$ are commute, we have

$$A(B(V_1)) = B(A(V_1)) = B(V_1), \forall A \in U(\mathcal{S}_1).$$

Thus $B(V_1)$ is a subrepresentation of $\mathcal{S}_1$, then there exists some i such that $B(V_1) = V_i$, we have two cases.

1. **Case 1**: $i \neq 1$.

   Without loss of generality, we may assume $B(V_1) = V_2$. Let C be an element in $U(\mathcal{S}_2)$ such that $C(V_1) \neq 0$ and C is different from B, $-B$. Then there exist j and k such that $C(V_1) = V_j$ and $(B+C)(V_1) = V_k$. On the other hand

   $$(B + C)(V_1) \subset V_2 \oplus V_j.$$

   In addition,

   $$V_k \cap (V_2 \oplus V_j) = \emptyset \text{ if } k \neq 2, j.$$

   Consequently, k is either 2 or j. If $j \neq 2$ then $(B + C)(V_1)$ is different from V_2 and V_j, then there will be no such k. Hence, $j = 2$ and therefore

   $$B(V_1) = V_2, \forall B \in U(\mathcal{S}_2),$$

   in other words $U(\mathcal{S}_2)(V_1) = V_2$. We then have

   $$\begin{aligned} U(\mathcal{S}_2)(V_2) &= U(\mathcal{S}_2)(U(\mathcal{S}_2)(V_1)) \\ &= (U(\mathcal{S}_2)U(\mathcal{S}_2))(V_1) \\ &= U(\mathcal{S}_2)(V_1) \\ &= V_2. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, V_2 is a subrepresentation of $U(\mathcal{S}_2)$, hence it is a subrepresentation of $\mathcal{S}_2$. For any $B \in \mathcal{S}_2$ we have $B(V_2) \subset V_2$. As V_2 is a complex vector space, by Schur's lemma the action of B on V_2 is a multiplication by a scalar c_B.

As $\mathcal{S}_2$ is simple, we have $[\mathcal{S}_2, \mathcal{S}_2] = 0$. Then, for any $B \in \mathcal{S}_2$ there exist $C, D \in \mathcal{S}_2$ such that

$$B = [C, D] = CD - DC,$$

then

$$c_B = c_C c_D - c_D c_C = 0.$$

Thus, the action of $\mathcal{S}_2$ on V_2 is the multiplication by zero, contradicting the fact that $ker(\mathcal{S}_2) = 0$.

2. **Case 2**: $i = 1$.

   Using the same argument as in case 1, we have $\mathcal{S}_2(V_1) = V_1$ and then the action of $\mathcal{S}_2$ on V_1 is the multiplication by zero, that is $V_1 \in ker(\mathcal{S}_2)$, a contradiction.

□

We now come back to the proof of Proposition 2. The action of $\mathcal{S}_1$ on $\mathfrak{g}$ is irreducible. For each j the action of $\mathcal{S}_j$ on $\mathfrak{g}$ is $\mathbb{C}$-linear and it commutes with the action of $\mathcal{S}_1$ on $\mathfrak{g}$. Let X_j be any non-zero element in $\mathcal{S}_j$, X_1 a non-zero element in $\mathcal{S}_1$. If $Y \in ker(X_j)$, i.e, $X_j(Y) = 0$, then

$$X_j(X_1(Y)) = X_1(X_j(Y)) = 0.$$

By Schur's lemma, X_j acts on $\mathfrak{g}$ as a scalar multiplication. Therefore, for any $X_j \in \mathcal{S}_j$, $X_j\,\mathfrak{g} = c_{X_j}\,\mathfrak{g}$ for some constant $c_{X_j} \in \mathbb{C}$. But then

$$X_j(\omega) = -l c_{X_j} \omega = 0.$$

It implies $c_{X_j} = 0$. Thus $\delta_j\,\mathfrak{g} = 0$ and therefore $\mathcal{S}_j = 0$ if $j \neq 1$, hence $\mathfrak{stab}(\omega) = \mathcal{S}_1$ is simple. □

In order to use Dynkin's classification we need the following

Lemma 6. *Let l be an integer smaller than $dim(\mathfrak{g})$, then $\mathfrak{sl}(\mathfrak{g})$ cannot preserve any l-form in $\mathfrak{g}$.*

Proof. For an l-form ω in $\mathfrak{g}$ and an element A in $\mathfrak{sl}(\mathfrak{g})$, if $A(\omega) \neq 0$ then the lemma is proved. If not, we consider a one ϵ-decomposable summand γ of ω, as $l < dim(g)$ then there exist another ϵ-decomposable l-form δ that equivalents to γ . From Proposition 1 we can write $\gamma = e^1 \wedge \eta$, $\delta = e^2 \wedge \eta$. Now we can make the entry in B (when regard it as a matrix in a basis that has e^1 and e^2 as component) that transforms e^1 to e^2 arbitrary large such that the new transformation is still in $\mathfrak{sl}(\mathfrak{g})$ and the coefficient of δ in $B(\omega)$ is different from zero, which contradicts with the fact that $A(\omega) = 0, \forall A \in \mathfrak{sl}(\mathfrak{g})$. □

Remark 3. *For any matrix $A \in \mathfrak{so}(\mathfrak{g})$, we can also make a_{ij} and a_{ji} arbitrarily large such that A still in $\mathfrak{so}(\mathfrak{g})$. Then we can apply the same argument as in Lemma 6 to prove that $\mathfrak{so}(\mathfrak{g})$ cannot preserve any l-form.*

Proposition 3. *If $l < dim(g)$ then $\mathfrak{stab}(\omega)$ cannot be $\mathfrak{sl}(g)$, $\mathfrak{so}(g)$ or $\mathfrak{sp}(g)$.*

Proof. From Lemma 6 and Remark 3 we have that $\mathfrak{stab}(\omega)$ cannot be either $\mathfrak{sl}(g)$ or $\mathfrak{so}(g)$.

If $\mathfrak{stab}(\omega) = \mathfrak{sp}(g)$ then it must preserve a non-zero skew-symmetric bilinear form α. Since $\mathfrak{ad}(\mathfrak{g}) \subset \mathfrak{stab}(\omega)$, the form α should be preserved by $\mathfrak{ad}(\mathfrak{g})$. But any bilinear form preserved by $\mathfrak{ad}(\mathfrak{g})$ must be a multiple of the Killing form on $\mathfrak{g}$, which is a symmetric form, a contradiction. □

We now come to the proof of the main theorem.

Proof. (Of the theorem)

As $\mathfrak{ad}(\mathfrak{g})$ is a subalgebra of $\mathfrak{stab}(\omega)$ and $\mathfrak{stab}(\omega)$ is simple, we now consider the triple $(\mathfrak{ad}(\mathfrak{g}), \mathfrak{stab}(\mathfrak{g}), id)$. Proposition 3 states that $\mathfrak{stab}(\mathfrak{g})$ cannot be $\mathfrak{sl}(\mathfrak{g})$, $\mathfrak{so}(\mathfrak{g})$ or $\mathfrak{sp}(\mathfrak{g})$. Hence, if $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \rho)$ be any triple that equivalent to $(\mathfrak{ad}(\mathfrak{g}), \mathfrak{stab}(\mathfrak{g}), id)$ then α_2 cannot be $\mathfrak{sl}(V)$, $\mathfrak{sp}(V)$ or $\mathfrak{so}(V)$ with V is the representation vector space of α_2 by ρ. So, we can look for possibilities of $(\mathfrak{ad}(\mathfrak{g}), \mathfrak{stab}(\omega), id)$ in Table 5 of [2].

Furthermore, the restriction of ρ on α_1 must isomorphic to the adjoint representation, as the restriction of id on $\mathfrak{ad}(\mathfrak{g})$ is the adjoint action. We can restrict the triple $(\mathfrak{ad}(\mathfrak{g}), \mathfrak{stab}(\mathfrak{g}), id)$ to the cases I_1 ($n \geq 2$,$k = 2$), I_2 ($n \geq 3$, $k = 2$), I_4 ($n \geq 4$, $k = 2$) by comparing the dimension of cases in Table 5 in [2].

In Table 5 in [2], the models for types I_1, I_2, I_4 are $(\mathfrak{sp}(n), \mathfrak{sl}(2n), \vee^2\rho_{2n})$, $(\mathfrak{so}(n), \mathfrak{sl}(2n+1), \wedge^2\rho_{2n+1})$ (n is odd), $(\mathfrak{so}(n), \mathfrak{sl}(2n), \wedge^2\rho_{2n})$ (n is even), respectively.

In addition, the triple $(\mathfrak{ad}(\mathfrak{g}), \mathfrak{stab}(\mathfrak{g}), id)$ has the property that $\mathfrak{stab}(\mathfrak{g})$ preserves a l-form on $\mathfrak{g}$. We will show that neither of the above three types satisfy this property if $l < dim(\mathfrak{g})$. For a prove of this, one only need to show that there exist an element X in $\mathfrak{sl}(m, \mathbb{C})$ ($m = 2n$ in cases I_2 and I_4 and $m = 2n+1$ in case I_1) such that $X(\omega) \neq 0$. But the proof of these facts are same as the proof of Lemma 6.

□

3.1 The Stabilizer Group

In this subsection we present a result which describes the stabilizer group of adjoint-invariant form ω of a complex simple Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ on $GL(\mathfrak{g})$. We assume that the degree of ω is strictly smaller than the dimension of $\mathfrak{g}$ and define

$$M(\mathfrak{g}) = \{\phi \in GL(\mathfrak{g}) \mid \phi^l = id_{\mathfrak{g}} \text{ and } ad(X) \circ \phi = \phi \circ ad(X) \ \forall \ X \in \mathfrak{g}\}$$

The following theorem is another version of Theorem 7 in [4], which proof is applicable in our case. Detailed proof can be found in [4, Theorem 7], here we give a sketch proof.

Theorem 2. *The set $M(\mathfrak{g})$ is an abelian normal subgroup of $Stab(\omega)$ and $Stab(\omega)$ is isomorphic to*

$$Aut(\mathfrak{g}) \ltimes M(\mathfrak{g})$$

via the map $(\alpha, \phi) \mapsto \alpha\phi$.

Proof. Since the Lie algebra of $Aut(\mathfrak{g})$ and $Stab(\omega)$ are coincide we have $Stab(\omega)^o = Aut(\mathfrak{g})^o$ and hence $Aut(\mathfrak{g})^o$ is a normal subgroup of $Stab(\omega)$. Consider $\psi \in Stab(\omega)$ then ψ defines an automorphism A on $Aut(\mathfrak{g})^o$ as $g \mapsto \psi g \psi^{-1}$. Observe that $\mathfrak{g}$ is simple then the derivative dA of A lies in $Aut(\mathfrak{g})$ and $\psi g \psi = dAgdA$ for all $g \in Aut(\mathfrak{g})^o$. Hence $dA^{-1}\psi$ lies in the centralizer of $Aut(\mathfrak{g})^o$ in $Stab(\omega)$. As in the proof of Lemma 4, we conclude that $dA^{-1}\psi$ is a scalar multiplication on $\mathfrak{g}$. That scalar should be an l-root of unity as $dA^{-1}\psi$ lies in $Stab(\omega)$, which implies that $dA^{-1}\psi$ lies in $M(\mathfrak{g})$. Thus $\psi = dA(dA^{-1}\omega) \in Aut(\mathfrak{g}).M(\mathfrak{g})$.Therefore

$$Stab(\omega) = Aut(\mathfrak{g}).M(\mathfrak{g}).$$

Next, we can easily verify that $Aut(\mathfrak{g})$ normalized $M(\mathfrak{g})$, it follows that $M(\mathfrak{g}) \lhd Stab(\omega)$.

Now, we only remain to prove that $M(\mathfrak{g}) \cap Aut(\mathfrak{g})$ is trivial. Suppose $\phi \in M(\mathfrak{g}) \cap Aut(\mathfrak{g})$. Since $\phi \in M(\mathfrak{g})$ and $\mathfrak{g}$ is a simple Lie algebra then ϕ is a multiplication by some scalar λ. In addition $\phi \in Aut(\mathfrak{g})$ then $\lambda[X, Y] = [\lambda X, \lambda Y] = \lambda^2[X, Y]$ for all $X, Y \in \mathfrak{g}$. It implies $\lambda = 1$. Therefore $M(\mathfrak{g}) \cap Aut(\mathfrak{g}) = \{id_{\mathfrak{g}}.\}$.

Thus, from these facts, we complete the proof.

□

References

[1] Ivan V. Arzhantsev, *Invariant Ideals and Matsushima's Criterion.* Preprint, available at arXiv:math/0506430, 2005.

[2] Dynkin E. B, *The maximal subgroups of the classical groups*, Tr. Mosk. Math. Soc., Vol. 1 (1952) pp. 1639 or Amer. Math. Soc. Transl. Ser 2, Vol. 6, pp. 245-378, 1957.

[3] Dominic D. Joyce, *Riemannian Holonomy Groups and Calibrated Geometry*, Oxford University Press, 2007.

[4] Anthony C. Kable, *The isotropy subalgebra of the canonical 3-form of a semisimple Lie algebra*, Indag. Mathem., N.S., Vol. 20 (1), pp. 73-85, 2009.

[5] George R. Kempf, *Instability in Invariant theory*, Annals of Mathematics, Second Series, Vol. 108, No. 2, pp. 299-316, 1978.

[6] Hông Vân Lê, *Geometric structures associateed with a simple Cartan 3-form*, Journal of Geometry and Physics, Vol. 70, pp. 205-223, 2013.

[7] Hông Vân Lê, Martin Panak, Jiri Vanzura, *Manifolds admiting stable forms*, Comm. Math. Carolinae, vol 49, n1, 101-117, 2008.

[8] Mumford D., Fogarty J., Kirwan F., *Geometric Invariant Theory*, 3rd ed. New York: Springer, 1994.